4

Manchester's book

Leaks Control of Hoover?

Books reviews, etc, where FBI has them and "research" on them filed

In 105-82555, Section 8? (second digit eliminated in xeroxing by FBI) with Serials beginning 55 - - there are two M.A.Jones to Mr. Wick Memos relating to William Manchester's "The Death of a President," dated 3/24 and 28/67. These are Not Recorded Serials. The stamp on the side indicating where the originals are filed is illegible. (It could be the 62-109060 file) "FCS" wrote both memos. Clearly both were intended for Hoover, who added an illegible note to the second.

I am reminded by the recent letter of Joe Schott, the former SA who wrote the book "No Left Turns," that what he called The Palace Guard had begun to move in on Hoover and take over by this time.

If the memo and attachment of "Details" had been written to feed the aging Hoover's dislikes, peeves and hates it could not have more perfectly done so.

Manchester's book is of incredible inaccuracy, a sick ego indulgence and a work of political ill will toward all not of his concept of the Camelot mind. There is no defense of the book itself possible, hardly any reasonable one can be made for the concept that brought it about, but the FBI's interest was limited to the most trivial nonsense about it, such as whether Hoover had sent RFK a note of condolences, the disciplining of the agents who were disciplined.

It also refers to Machester's report that the FBI Report ordered by LBJ, CD1, was leaked to a news magazine. Tolson's note on a different copy, ~~xx~~ asking "What do we know about this?"led to the second memo. The lies in it, while subject to other interpretation, are, I think, a fairly clear indication that others were manipulating Hoover by controlling what he knew and what misinformation reached him.

The alternative is that Hoover knew better and demanded the creation of all these false records, many other than the one cited.

This one states that "A review of our files reflects that the Bureau's first report was completed on December 9, 1963." Even technically this can't be true, meaning that even the reproduction and binding should have been completed before then because that is the day that, through channels, it reached the Commission. The channel was to Katzenbach to the White House to the Commission. In addition, the writing, quite obviously, had to have been competed earlier for the entire five volumes to have been completed and bound by then. The actuality is that despite the next quoted lie the FBI had the work well in hand and had leaked, with the first leak I recall published four days earlier, 12/5/63. The next lie referred to is that "The FBI did not leak the results of its investigation and did everything it could to maintain the security of its reports." The FBI did do the leaking, through the DeLoach/Bishop function to my knowledge, ~~x~~ which comes from one of the benficiaries of the leaking. Meanwhile, DeLoach was writing self-serving memos that would tend to blame others for his leakings. This cites one he wrote to Katzenbach.

There should be other relevant records, like the raw material of the "research" and they would not likely be in the 105 or 62 files. More likely are those of the division and/or 94, perhaps 80, where no searches were made.

or earlier
11/27 - See Docs in
#/PS Manual